

London Cycling Campaign

9 September 2016

Westminster Green Park to Pimlico Quietway

<https://www.westminster.gov.uk/quietway-route-green-park-pimlico>

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on plans. Its response was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC's Infrastructure Review Group and in support of the response from the Westminster Cycling Campaign, the borough group.

LCC requires schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less.

LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all "Quietway" highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all "Critical Fails" eliminated.

LCC has the following specific points on the scheme and its surrounds:

- The routing of this Quietway is very welcome as it links CS5 and the East-West Cycle Superhighway.
- Unfortunately, like far too many Quietway schemes recently gone to consultation in Westminster and elsewhere, the measures proposed are not sufficient, in too many parts of the route, to enable a broader demographic of people to cycle the route (for instance children and parents in the area cycling to school). Enabling more people to cycle is one of the key aims of the Quietway programme – but this scheme will not achieve that in all likelihood. Therefore, we cannot support these proposals, unless significantly strengthened at a significant number of points.
- Buckingham Gate is particularly one of the biggest issues – as it features more traffic than a "Quietway" scheme should have. There are also no proposed motor vehicle speed control measures here. And there appear to be several points on the proposal where there are likely width "critical fails" as per CLOS. At the junctions, the design flares to two lanes also – with likely associated hook risks and aggressive driver behaviour. As a result, this street is not suitable for a Quietway without significant modification.
- Palace Street is also wide, with no motor vehicle speed control measures and likely "critical fail" widths.
- Palace Street/ Victoria Street/ Thirleby Road junction is where Dr Katherine Giles was killed as she waited to turn from Palace Street to Victoria Street, by an HGV. Nothing has been proposed to improve this junction, and avoid such a fatality happening again. Coming from Thirleby Road, the junction is preceded by a complex merge of three streets just before the ASL. Again, the entire junction needs redesigning to enable those cycling to pass through in comfort and safety, from all directions and to all directions. The pedestrian refuge also looks likely to introduce a "critical fail" width nearby it.
- It's likely there are also width critical fails on Thirleby Road and Emery Hill Street where usable space is impacted by on-street parking.
- Rochester Row currently features a pinch point for those cycling south-west between the pedestrian refuge and parking – this should be dealt with.
- The crossing between Emery Hill Street and Vincent Square is not improved enough to enable a wider range of people to cycle the route – while the refuge will be welcome for those who already cycle this route, further treatment is required to enable new people to use it – who will not feel comfortable waiting in a narrow refuge with traffic passing on both sides. This will particularly be an issue for anyone using an adapted cycle, cargo bike etc.

- Vincent Square is already heavily cycled – counts conducted by the Westminster Cycling Campaign in 2014 already showed those cycling outnumbering motor vehicles during some periods of the day. Far more must be done, then to further enable this demonstrable "desire line". The ideal would be the use of modal filters across the nearby area to remove through traffic completely. But at the bare minimum, contra-flow cycling should be provided for. This will be a far inferior solution compared to modal filters, however.
- Modal filters would also likely vastly improve Douglas Street. Failing that, reversing the direction of one-way motor traffic flow would likely reduce volumes further. Either way, providing for two-way cycling here is welcome.